Case 3:15-cr-00041-CRB Document 53 Filed 01/28/15 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

| United States of Ame | rica, | Case No. CR 15- | - 041 - CRB | |
|---|---|----------------------------|--|--|
| Plaint v. | ff,)) | | ER EXCLUDING TIME DY TRIA FACTLE D | |
| DANA LEWIS Defend |) | | JAN 282015 | |
| | • | 05 0015 11 | RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNI | |
| Speedy Trial Act from 5 the by the Speedy Trial Act from 5 the by the continuance outweigh 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court m | me best interest of the public | c and the detendant in a | Court excludes time under the nds that the ends of justice served speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § collowing factor(s): | |
| | t a continuance would be lik § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i). | cely to result in a miscar | rriage of justice. | |
| defendants, or law, that it | The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). | | | |
| | Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). | | | |
| counsel's other | | · · | dant continuity of counsel, given the exercise of due diligence. | |
| necessary for | at a continuance would unreateffective preparation, taking § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). | • | | |
| IT IS SO ORDERE |). | | | |
| DATED: 1 28/7 | 015 | JOSEPH C. SPERO | | |
| STIPULATED: Atto | mey for Defendant | United States Chief I | Wiffer- | |